

Remarks/Arguments:

Introduction

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 17, 19 and 21 have been amended and claims 22-29 have been added. Accordingly, claims 17-29 remain pending in this application. It is submitted that no new matter has been added.

Initially, the applicants would like to thank Examiner KEZHEN SHEN and Primary Examiner DANIELL NEGRON for the courtesies extended to Applicants representatives during the personal interview conducted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 14, 2010. During the interview, the parties discussed the features contained in the above amendments to independent claims 17 and 19 as well as in newly added independent claims 22, 24, 26 and 28. As reflected on the Interview Summary form (PTOL-413), agreement was reached that each of independent claims 17, 19, 22, 24, 26 and 28 would be effective to overcome the prior art. Included next is the Substance of the Interview.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tadayuki et al. (JP 8-329469) in view of Hashimoto et al. (USPN: 6,526,146).

Without intending to acquiesce to the aforementioned rejection and in order to more clearly distinguish independent claims 17 and 19 over the references, each of independent claims 17 and 19 has been amended as proposed during the personal interview to recite "first memory" and "second memory". These two memories are shown, for example, as elements 102 & 112 in Fig. 2. Additionally, independent claims 17 and 19 have been amended to more clearly define that recited operations are performed when recording or replaying in the drive device is resumed after supply of power to the drive device is suspended while supply of power to the control device is maintained.

It is submitted that the prior art references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the aforementioned features as recited in each of amended

independent claims 17 and 19. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


Additionally, it is noted that newly added independent claims 22, 24, 26 and 28 recite the same aforementioned features as independent claims 17 and 19 for distinguishing over the prior art references. Thus, independent claims 22, 24, 26 and 28 are also patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 17 and 19.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claims 17, 19, 22, 24, 26 and 28, as well as claims 18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27 and 29 dependent thereon, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,518
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/nm

Dated: November 17, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

1019078